



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.ajog.2018.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2018.04.009)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Romero, R., Conde-Agudelo, A., & Nicolaides, K. H. (2018). There is insufficient evidence to claim that cerclage is the treatment of choice for patients with a cervical length <10mm. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2018.04.009>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Accepted Manuscript



There is insufficient evidence to claim that cerclage is the treatment of choice for patients with a cervical length <10mm

Roberto Romero, MD, DMedSci, Agustin Conde-Agudelo, MD, MPH, PhD, Kypros H. Nicolaides, MD

PII: S0002-9378(18)30287-4

DOI: [10.1016/j.ajog.2018.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2018.04.009)

Reference: YMOB 12133

To appear in: *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*

Received Date: 23 March 2018

Accepted Date: 2 April 2018

Please cite this article as: Romero R, Conde-Agudelo A, Nicolaides KH, There is insufficient evidence to claim that cerclage is the treatment of choice for patients with a cervical length <10mm, *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* (2018), doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2018.04.009.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

**There is insufficient evidence to claim that cerclage is the treatment of choice
for patients with a cervical length <10mm**

Roberto Romero, MD, DMedSci

Perinatology Research Branch, Division of Obstetrics and Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Division of Intramural Research, *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, Bethesda, MD and Detroit, MI, USA

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

Center for Molecular Medicine and Genetics, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA

prbchiefstaff@med.wayne.edu

Agustin Conde-Agudelo, MD, MPH, PhD

Perinatology Research Branch, Division of Obstetrics and Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Division of Intramural Research, *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, Bethesda, MD and Detroit, MI, USA

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Wayne State University School of Medicine, Detroit, MI, USA

Kypros H. Nicolaides, MD

Harris Birthright Research Centre for Fetal Medicine, King's College Hospital, London, UK

We thank Dr Powel et al for their interest in our report as well as in the optimal treatment of patients with a short cervix. The Letter to the Editor raised some questions about the prevention of preterm birth in women with a singleton gestation and an extremely short cervix, defined as a cervical length <10 mm.

First, we would like to reaffirm that our individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis clearly showed that vaginal progesterone significantly reduced the risk of preterm birth <33 weeks of gestation in women with a singleton gestation and a cervical length ≤ 25 mm, regardless of their history of previous spontaneous preterm birth (relative risk [RR], 0.65; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.45-0.94 for women with no previous spontaneous preterm birth, and RR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.40-0.88 for women with previous spontaneous preterm birth).¹ The quality of the evidence in support of this conclusion was graded as high, which means that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect, and that further research is very unlikely to change this estimate.²

Second, a subgroup analysis according to cervical length showed that vaginal progesterone did not appear to decrease the risk of preterm birth <33 weeks of gestation in women with a cervical length <10 mm (RR, 0.97; 95% CI, 0.59-1.59). Given that the confidence interval overlaps with those of women with a cervical length between 10-20 mm (0.42-0.81) and 21-25 mm (0.22-1.38) and that the interaction P value for subgroup differences was non-significant (0.22), it is likely that the beneficial effect of vaginal progesterone on the risk of preterm birth <33 weeks of gestation does not differ significantly between patients with a cervical length <10 mm and those with a cervical length between 10-25 mm. This is the standard interpretation of an interaction P value for subgroup differences, which addresses the likelihood

that chance explains the apparent differences in effect across subgroups and helps to avoid spuriously positive or negative subgroup findings.³

It is important to note that the beneficial effect of vaginal progesterone on the risk of composite neonatal morbidity and mortality did not differ significantly between women with a cervical length <10 mm (RR, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.33-1.41) and those with a cervical length between 10-25 mm (RR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.35-0.99) (*P* value for interaction=0.75).

Third, the IPD meta-analysis published by Berghella et al⁴ reported that the rates of preterm birth <37, <35, <34, <32, <28, and <24 weeks of gestation and adverse perinatal outcomes were not significantly different between the cerclage and no cerclage groups in women without a history of previous spontaneous preterm birth and a cervical length <25 mm. However, the quality of evidence was graded as low, which means that the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect of the study, and that further research is very likely to change this estimate.² A subgroup analysis found that, among women with a cervical length <10 mm, cerclage was associated with a significant decrease in the risk of preterm birth <35 weeks of gestation (RR, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.47-0.98). The authors correctly concluded that “cerclage seems to be possibly efficacious” in this subgroup of women and recommended that “well-powered trials should be carried in these patients.”

Fourth, subgroup analyses are known to have limitations such as false-positive results due to multiple comparisons, false-negative results due to inadequate power, and a limited ability to inform individual treatment decisions because patients have multiple characteristics that vary simultaneously.³ Even when performed correctly, most differences in treatment efficacy derived from subgroup analyses prove to be spurious and, therefore, should be considered hypothesis-generating rather than hypothesis-testing.³

The findings described in the subgroup analyses of the IPD meta-analyses by Berghella et al⁴ and our team¹ regarding the efficacy of cerclage and vaginal progesterone in women with a cervical length <10 mm are exploratory and hypothesis-generating analyses, which require confirmatory research. These exploratory analyses should be considered tentative, until confirmed or refuted by subsequent studies.

In conclusion, we recommend that clinicians:

- continue to perform universal transvaginal cervical length screening at 18–24 weeks of gestation in women with a singleton gestation and to offer vaginal progesterone to those with a cervical length ≤ 25 mm, regardless of the history of previous spontaneous preterm birth, with the aim of preventing preterm birth and reducing neonatal morbidity and mortality.⁵ This strategy has proven to be cost-effective and to reduce preterm birth rates when universally implemented;
- consider that cerclage has been shown to reduce the risk of preterm birth and adverse perinatal outcomes in women with a singleton gestation, history of previous spontaneous preterm birth, and a cervical length <25 mm; thus, it can also be offered to patients with these characteristics.⁵ Other factors, such as adverse events and cost-effectiveness of interventions, and patient/physician preference, should be taken into consideration when counseling patients;
- be aware that there is insufficient evidence to support the use of cerclage in patients with a short cervix in the absence of a history of preterm birth.

We believe that further randomized controlled trials to assess the efficacy and safety of vaginal progesterone vs cerclage in women with a cervical length <10 mm are warranted.

Roberto Romero, MD, DMedSci

Perinatology Research Branch, Division of Obstetrics and Maternal-Fetal Medicine,, Division of Intramural Research, *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, Bethesda, MD and Detroit, MI, USA

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

Center for Molecular Medicine and Genetics, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA

prbchiefstaff@med.wayne.edu

Agustin Conde-Agudelo, MD, MPH, PhD

Perinatology Research Branch, Division of Obstetrics and Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Division of Intramural Research, *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, Bethesda, MD and Detroit, MI, USA

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Wayne State University School of Medicine, Detroit, MI, USA

Kypros H. Nicolaides, MD

Harris Birthright Research Centre for Fetal Medicine, King's College Hospital, London, UK

The authors report no conflict of interest

REFERENCES

1. Romero R, Conde-Agudelo A, Da Fonseca E, et al. Vaginal progesterone for preventing preterm birth and adverse perinatal outcomes in singleton gestations with a short cervix: a meta-analysis of individual patient data. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2018;218:161-80.
2. Schünemann H, Brozek J, Guyatt G, Oxman A. GRADE handbook for grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendation. The GRADE Working Group 2013.
3. Klebanoff M. 17 Alpha-hydroxyprogesterone caproate for preterm prevention: issues in subgroup analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2016;214:306-7.

4. Berghella V, Ciardulli A, Rust OA, et al. Cerclage for sonographic short cervix in singleton gestations without prior spontaneous preterm birth: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials using individual patient-level data. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2017;50:569-77.

5. Conde-Agudelo A, Romero R. Vaginal progesterone to prevent preterm birth in pregnant women with a sonographic short cervix: clinical and public health implications. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2016;214:235-42.